EDITORIAL

Newman Lectures. The course of lectures on the New Testament started as scheduled, in October, and about twenty-six students have signed on for the session. This is quite satisfactory as an audience for a course being given for the first time and it is also a convenient number from the point of view of the lecturer, in view of the written work he has to correct. We hope nevertheless to see the numbers grow in future years. The lectures have already underlined the need for more abundant up-to-date Catholic literature on the Scriptures, and hence the need, among other things, for our forthcoming Commentary.

Annual General Meeting. As previously announced this will take place on Thursday, 3rd January at 6 p.m. at the Newman Centre, 31 Portman Square, London, W.1. By the time these words appear in print the meeting will be over, but an account of it must be postponed until the next issue of SCRIPTURE. The General Meeting will be followed by a paper on a Biblical subject, previously announced in the Catholic Press.

The Jerusalem Bible. This continues to appear steadily and rapidly. The latest volumes to be published are Genesis by Père de Vaux, and Jeremias by A. Gelin, P.S.S. These will be reviewed in a later issue.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH THE PROPHET

IN 1908 the Biblical Commission, which represents the Holy See at Rome in matters biblical, took occasion of some answers which it was issuing with regard to Isaiah to lay down principles concerning prophecy in general. The answers are all in the negative in the official Latin text, consisting in all cases of simply one word, *negative* : it is the questions which are carefully framed in order to make this simple answer possible.

The first question is whether it may be taught that there are no true prophecies in Isaiah, or in Scripture generally. To the Catholic it will seem obvious enough that the answer can only be, no. But in reality the point is of fundamental importance, because outside the Church the majority of biblical students are not really prepared simply to follow the evidence, but have resort to one or other of the two evasions mentioned by the Commission, contending either that the so-called prophecy was composed after the event, or that it was just a good guess. If I may take an example (with all reverence) from our Lord's own words, in the course of His ministry an intelligent man might have felt fairly certain that before long the Romans would attack and take Jerusalem ; and so it would be unwise to take our Lord's own words to that effect as a proof of His power of prophecy, though of course we know that He had absolute knowledge of all future events. But His prophecy of His own resurrection is amply testified and admits of no reasonable doubt. The chief prophecies in Isaiah concern the Virgin Birth of our Lord and His redeeming death.

The second question is whether the view may be held that Isaiah and the other prophets foretold only events that were to happen soon, and whether such a view can be reconciled with the messianic and eschatological prophecies that were to be fulfilled only after a long time, as was held generally by the Fathers of the Church. By a 'messianic' prophecy is meant one whereby our Lord is indicated as the Messiah, as in the two prophecies in Isaiah already mentioned. An 'eschatological' prophecy is one dealing with the end of the world, as in Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, or the last three verses of Malachy.

The third question asks whether it can be admitted that the prophets must always have addressed, not future hearers, but only their own contemporaries, so as to be understood easily by them : and that therefore the second part of Isaiah (chaps xl-lxvi), in which the prophet addresses and consoles, as though living among them, not the Jews who were Isaiah's contemporaries, but the Jews mourning in their Babylonian exile (about 587-538 B.C.), cannot have had as its author Isaiah, who was long dead, but must be assigned to some unknown prophet living among the exiles. The answer once more is in the negative : it is not definitely

asserted that the second part of Isaiah *did* have the prophet for author, but the opinion is rejected that it *cannot* have had him for author. The point may be illustrated from St John Chrysostom's exposition of Psalm 44 (Vulgate 43 : *Deus auribus nostris*). 'This psalm', he writes, 'the prophet (i.e., David) speaks, not in his own person, but in the person of the Maccabees, relating and foretelling things that were to happen at that time, For such are the prophets : they run over all times, past, present and future' (Migne, *Patres Graeci*, Vol. LV, column 167 : this passage is included in the breviary lessons for the fourth Sunday of October). Still, of course, normally speaking, the presumption is that a prophet is living among those whom he is addressing and consoling. Père Calès, s.j., in his edition of the Psalms (Paris, Beauchesne, 1936 : Vol. I, p. 465), remarks that nothing in the psalm suggests such a miracle of foresight, but suggests that perhaps the best solution is to suppose that the psalm underwent some slight adaptation at the time of the Maccabees. Patrizi (he mentions) simply admitted the Maccabean interpretation and date. The Biblical Commission (1910) does not object to any definite psalm being called Maccabean, but only to 'not a few of them' being so dated. I have brought up this psalm by way of supplying some background to this question of a 'miracle of foresight'. But of course all true prophecy involves to some extent such a miracle.

The fourth question asks whether the philological argument, from language and style, is such as to compel a serious man, an expert in the critical art and in the Hebrew language, to admit in the Book of Isaiah a plurality of authors. In using such a strong word as compel (*cogat*) the Biblical Commission shows itself cautious. It would have been easy to prescribe simply that the simple authorship of Isaiah alone was to be defended as absolutely certain. This, however, is not said, but only that the *denial* of such a single authorship is not absolutely certain, a very different proposition, which does not forbid that a plurality of authors should be absolutely excluded. It seems reasonable to conclude that it may be admitted as possible.

Before treating of the matter further it seems wiser to pass on to the fifth and last question : whether there be solid arguments, even taken cumulatively, to prove that the book of Isaiah is not be to attributed to Isaiah himself alone, but to two, or even to more authors. This question too is met with a denial : but it is denial only that a plurality of authors can be proved. Once more it may be remarked that the answer is a cautious one, for it is not asserted that it is proved that the Book of Isaiah has a single author, but only that it is not proved that it has more than one. It may still be held, therefore, that the plurality of authors is a possible view, or even, so far as words go, that it is the more likely view, though such an opinion is hardly to be encouraged.

The main question is, whether we are to suppose one or two Isaiahs : whether besides the main prophecy (chaps i–xxxix) there is a

second part of different authorship. As a matter of fact, besides a second
Isaiah ('Deutero–Isaiah') a third Isaiah ('Trito-Isaiah', chaps lvi–lxvi)
has been proposed, with some later fragments even in this portion.
The sacred books, in fact, are nowadays subjected to a vivisection such
as does not seem to find any real parallel on anything like the same scale
in secular literature. It does not seem worth while to discuss all these
comparatively minute points, but we may confine our attention, as has
been said, to 'Deutero–Isaiah'. (*Deuteros* in Greek means 'second', and
Tritos means 'third'.) Henceforth I shall speak of chaps i–xxxix as 'Part I'
and chaps xl–lxvi as 'Part II'.

Part II has more unity about it, though for the sake of brevity one
must make the unity appear rather greater than it really is. It may be
divided into (1) Jehovah's glory in the deliverance of His people, by
the defeat of Babylon and its idols: chaps xl–xlviii: (2) the Servant of
Jehovah: the expiation of Israel's ·sin: Israel's deliverance: chaps
xlix–lv: (3) the glory of the New Jerusalem. The people are pictured
as if in the Babylonian exile (xlvii, 5–6), Jerusalem and the Temple in
ruins (xliv, 26–28): but the exiles are to return (xlviii, 20–21: li, 11:
lii, 1–2), Jerusalem is to be restored (lii, 1–2, 8–9), whereas Babylon is
to be destroyed (xlvii, 1–5: xlvii, 14). The deliverer is to be Cyrus
(xliv, 28: xlv, 1–7), who reigned 538–529 B.C., but whom one might
suppose from these texts to be already known to readers living under
Hezekiah (725–697 B.C.), to whose reign belong chaps xxxvi–xxxix.
In such a periodical as the present I feel that I ought not to hide such
reasons as this, which make students outside the Church practically
unanimous in relegating Deutero–Isaiah to the time of the Babylonian
exile; but on the other hand the Biblical Commission, which acts in
these matters with the authority of the Holy See, must have our obedience
and sympathy in declining to throw overboard, once for all, the strong
tradition of centuries, and in insisting that in a case like this one the
question cannot and must not be regarded as finally closed in favour
of the late date. Nor must it be thought that the Holy See is demanding
a perfectly blind obedience in such matters of biblical criticism. The
Blessed Pope Pius X, one of whose chief merits was to crush the danger
of Modernism within the Church, could still write an appreciative letter
to the Bishop of La Rochelle (Le Camus) in 1906, printed in Denzinger's
well-known *Euchiridion* (in a footnote to no. 1946), in which, while
he blames the excessive freedom of those who pay more heed to novelties
than to the authority of the Church, he also lays it down that the pro-
ceedings of those are not to be approved, who never dare to break
away in any respect from the biblical exegesis which up to
yesterday was in vogue, even when, with the integrity of the faith
safeguarded, the same progress of studies invites them to do so
courageously.'

But to return to Deutero–Isaiah. Within this part comes 'the Passion-chapter of Isaiah', chap. liii, to which must be attached lii, 13–15, which evidently is closely bound up with it. Here is depicted one who is to suffer a terrible death, yet not on account of any sins of his own, but for the sake of mankind :

There was no form or majesty in him that we should look upon him,
  Nor beauty that we should desire him . . .
Verily he hath borne our infirmities,
  And hath carried our pains :
And we accounted him stricken,
  And smitten of God and afflicted.
Nevertheless he was pierced because of our transgressions,
  Crushed because of our iniquities :
The chastisement that hath brought peace to us was upon him,
  And by his blows we have been healed.
All we like sheep had gone astray,
  We had turned everyone to his own way ;
And Jehovah made to light upon him
  The guilt of us all . . .
He poured out his soul unto death,
  And was numbered with the transgressors,
Whereas he bore the sin of many,
  And interceded for the transgressors.

I have kept the past tenses as is usually done, but it may be well to remark that the only two true Hebrew tenses are really indifferent to time—an example of the astonishing deficiences of the Hebrew language, above which it still emerges triumphant—and the tenses essentially indicate only completed or incompleted action, so that they can be applied to past, present or future, according to certain recognized conventions, and yet to some extent at the translator's risk.

This and three other passages are called the 'Servant Songs', because they concern one called a 'Servant'—evidently in this chapter our Lord. The other passages are xlii, 1–4 ('Behold my servant') : xlix, 1–6 (or even to the end of the chapter : the *Nunc Dimittis* in Luke ii, 32 quotes 'light to the gentiles' from Isaiah xlix, 6) : and l, 4–9, which last to some extent prepares the way for the Passion chapter. It may be noted that in Isaiah xlix, 3 it is widely admitted that there is a good case for omitting 'Israel' : an individual is speaking, the servant who is 'to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel' (6) : it makes no sense if the servant himself is to *be* Israel. In any case there does not seem sufficient warrant for extracting these four passages and making them into a separate 'source' ; they fit in well enough where they come, for even 'Deutero–Isaiah' does not write according to a preconceived

logical scheme, though there is more of this in the second part than in the first.

The first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah, in fact, may be divided into six main sections, without much connection between them. They may be headed here conveniently A B C D E F : the headings must not be pressed too strictly.

A : chaps i–xii : prophecies about Judah. There is strong invective in these early chapters, and promise of chastisement, but with promise of a glorious remnant, especially in iv, 3–6 : cf. Rom. xi, 1–7. The remnant appears also in Isaiah vi, 13. In vi is the vision and call of Isaiah, with which may be compared those of Jeremiah (Jeremiah i) and Ezekiel (Ezekiel i–iii) ; it takes place 'in the year that King Uzziah died, 747 (vi, 1). The general background of vii–xii is that Syria ('Aram', with Damascus for capital) and Israel (the northern kingdom) combine against Judah, but are to be overwhelmed by Assyria (vii, 1–2, 16–17 : viii, 4 : x, 5–27). Against this background we have much Messianic prophecy, in which the first part of Isaiah abounds as much as the second : vii, 14–16 : viii, 3–4 : ix, 1–7 : xi, 1–9.

I have written at some length about the Emmanuel Prophecy (vii, 14), which chiefly comes into question here, in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (published from Washington by the Catholic Biblical Association of America) for 1946, and 1947,[1] and can only summarize very briefly here what I have already written. The doctrine of compenetration, indeed, I have expounded more than once, and I think that both the principle and the name have found considerable acceptance. The doctrine comes ultimately from St Jerome's commentary on Daniel xi, 21 ff., whence St Thomas, in the preface to his commentary on the Psalms, takes it without mention of St Jerome, but enunciates it with more precision, as follows :

'Prophecies are sometimes uttered about things which existed at the time in question, but are not uttered primarily with reference to them, but in so far as they are a figure of things to come ; and therefore the Holy Ghost has provided that when such prophecies are uttered, some details should be inserted which go beyond the actual thing done, in order that the mind may be raised to the thing signified.'

In Isaiah vii, 14, the word translated 'virgin' in the Latin Vulgate and in the Revised Version, and also in the Septuagint (=the Greek Old Testament), cannot be taken in quite such a narrow sense in the Hebrew, which has another word (*bethulah*) for a virgin as such. The Hebrew word here ('*almah*) is more accurately translated 'girl'. Normally the 'girl' would be understood to be a virgin, but need not always be so.

---

[1] Vol. III, No. 4 : *The Emmanuel Prophecy*; Vol. IX, No. 1 : *The Term 'Almah in Isaiah vii*, 14; Vol. IX, No. 2 : *Various Interpretations of Isaiah vii*, 14. In this last number see also *Second Isaias : the Literary Problem* by R. T. Murphy, O.P., S.S.L.

In the titles of some of the psalms the word is used to indicate sopranos. But the crucial passage, which I feel bound to mention here, is Prov. xxx,19–20. The chapter contains a series of comparisons : three examples of some quality are cited, leading up to a fourth, in which is the real point and purpose of the others. The passing of an eagle through the air, or of a serpent over a rock, or of a ship through the sea leaves no trace ; nor yet does the dealing of a man with one who (only at the outset) is called a 'girl' ('*almah*'), and in the next verse is said to wipe her mouth (i.e., removing all trace of the transaction) and to say she has done nothing wrong (also, quite a modern touch).

But the word, as I have said, would normally be understood to imply a virgin, and so has a certain fitness here, for there is a compenetration between the child to be born immediately and Christ Himself, as Cardinal Billot, for example, pointed out in a series of articles in the *Etudes*, the organ of the French Jesuit Fathers, the first of which appeared in June 1917. Before the child comes to the use of reason, Syria and Israel (the northern kingdom), whose attack is so feared by King Ahaz at Jerusalem, will be devastated by Assyria (Isaiah vii, 16). But there is a greater deliverance showing through, as it were, for the child to be born immediately cannot satisfy all the glorious description of deliverance which we find, for example, in chaps xi–xii. The subject is too large to be dealt with adequately here.

In chaps xiii–xxiii (=B) we have prophecies and denunciations against the nations, of a recognized pattern, found also (e.g.) in Jeremiah xlvi–xlix, followed by the tremendous attack on Babylon in Jeremiah l–li. In xxiv–xxvi (=C) there is a picture of universal judgment, and of the restoration of Israel. In xxviii–xxxiii (=D) we have woes pronounced on Hebrews and Gentiles, but with hope offered to the latter, as again in xxxiv–xxxv (=E). The first part concludes with a prose section, xxxvi–xxxix (=F), which is chiefly concerned with the good king Hezekiah. Space forbids that I should enlarge on these sections ; I have tried to dilate only on the more important sections, leaving of course much unsaid in what is only a very general treatment.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL[1]

IF we except the views of the Alogi, obscure second century heretics who denied the Johannine authorship, not on historical but on doctrinal grounds, there was never any doubt until modern times, that John, the son of Zebedee and one of the twelve apostles, wrote the fourth gospel. The remarkable differences that exist between the Syn. on the one hand and the fourth Gospel on the other are claimed by many moderns as militating against the ascription of the latter to one of Christ's disciples. These differences however, were equally well known to the ancients and nevertheless they regarded the son of Zebedee as author. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that a cogent reason for the modern denial is or at least, was, the clear and even startling portrayal in the fourth Gospel of the divine sonship of Christ. If it could be shown that the gospel was not in fact written by one of our Lord's immediate followers, but by a Christian of later date, the force of the historical evidence would be weakened thus making it easier to deny its claims. It was felt that time must be allowed for the growth of a belief in Christ's divinity such as we see illustrated in the fourth Gospel; and the Tübingen School, for example, assigned to it the date A.D. 160–170. To-day of course, in the light of recent research and manuscript discoveries[2] it is not possible to date it later than the first quarter of the second century and since the traditional date for the gospel is c. A.D. 100, this motive for denying the Johannine authorship has largely disappeared.

If the Gospel were written about the end of the first century and if John the Apostle did indeed survive till then, it might be thought to make little difference to the accuracy of the narrative, whether it was written by him personally or by one who was his contemporary. Nevertheless though the Apostle is now generally allowed to have had a large part in providing the material of the Gospel, it is still denied by many moderns that he actually wrote it. It is suggested for example that the Gospel clearly distinguishes between the *writer* and the eyewitness in xix, 35 and xxi, 24. It is allowed that in these passages the eyewitness is the Beloved Disciple, John the son of Zebedee. In xix, 35, '*his* witness is true', it is argued, the writer of the Gospel is testifying to the truth of the Beloved Disciple's witness, and 'He knoweth that he saith true' is a statement by the writer that the Apostle, now very old, is fully conscious of the truth of his witness, Bernard.[3] This interpretation is by no means

[2] Cf. the Rylands Fragment (early second century) containing John xviii, 31, 32, 37, 38.
[3] *St John* in *International Critical Commentary*.

obvious. Why should one who was *ex hypothesi* not an eyewitness testify to the truth of the witness of one who was? It would surely be more natural to invoke the eyewitness in corroboration of the writer's own statement. As for Bernard's interpretation of the following statement (He [ἐκεῖνος] knoweth that he saith true), he has to admit that it is quite natural to interpret the ἐκεῖνος, as the actual writer of the Gospel (cf. John ix, 37 where Christ uses ἐκεῖνος of himself). But if it does so refer, then we are more or less obliged to identify witness with writer, for otherwise we should have a needless repetition of the preceding sentence. Why should it be thought unlikely that the writer should refer to himself in the third person? After all, St Paul does so in II Cor. xii, 2–5. To put it at its lowest John xix, 35 may equally well be taken in this way and since tradition has in fact always so taken it, we conclude this is the right interpretation.

It is asked further how we are to account for the strange reticence of the Evangelist regarding the actual name of the Beloved Disciple— Strachan[1] notes the traditional theory that the author here refers to himself as the son of Zebedee, but that as author, he keeps himself in the background (p. 82) 'Yet', he says, 'the terms of such a reference can scarcely be called modest. It is a much simpler interpretation to suppose that the author of the Gospel is referring to someone other than himself. Then the epithet "whom Jesus loved" becomes intelligible.'

But surely Strachan has smoothed out one difficulty only to raise a greater—for while it is easy to understand why the son of Zebedee does not name himself if he is indeed the author of the Gospel, it is by no means easy to see why the son of Zebedee is not mentioned by name if the gospel were written by someone else.

Moreover, is the title 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' in the mouth of that disciple such an offence against modesty? Given that Jesus had in fact a special predilection for the youngest of the apostles, John would naturally be struck by the wonder of it and might explain it simply on grounds of his being the Benjamin of Christ's immediate followers and not because of any special merits he might possess.

It is then, it seems, on such grounds as these that we are asked to distinguish between the witness to whom we owe practically all the information in the Gospel and the writer who records it for us, while at the same time rejecting a constant tradition which identifies the two. 'Speaking generally', says Dr Bernard, 'one cannot distinguish by any features of internal evidence, those parts of the Gospel narrative which plainly rest upon the report of an eyewitness, and those which may be referred to the evangelist' (p. lxxviii). One should go further. Even if the evidence of the Gospel were compatible with the theory that the writer, not himself an eyewitness, gathered his information from one who was,

[1] *The Fourth Gospel, its significance and environment.*

it is clearly more intelligible on the assumption that the eyewitness wrote it himself. There are whole pages of the Gospel where it is unthinkable that anyone but the witness wrote them—or at least dictated them word for word, which comes to the same thing (e.g., chap. i, 19 ff, chap. vi, chap. ix, chap. 13–17). Indeed Dr Bernard at times seems to allow to the 'writer' of the Gospel, a role hardly greater than that of scribe. But no Catholic would object to the suggestion that John, like Paul (Roman xvi, 22) used a scribe to write down his compositions.

It is further pointed out that the Apocalypse, admitted to be by John the Apostle, has no reticence like the Gospel on this point, but gives the name of John openly and repeatedly—why then not the Gospel also, if indeed the Apostle wrote it?

Without pretending to solve every difficulty it may be observed that the Apocalypse is very different from the Gospel. It is a book of prophecy in which the identity of the prophet has considerable relevance. The Gospel on the other hand is a record of the deeds and words of Jesus Christ in which there is much less need to name the author.

Many critics have gone further and attempted to identify the writer of the Gospel as distinct from the witness. It is recognized that the author of the Gospel also wrote the Johannine epistles. Now John ii and iii each starts by naming the writer as ὁ πρεσβύτερος, *the Presbyter or Elder*. This term, it is argued, is used in Acts xv, 4, 22 to distinguish the disciples of the apostles from the apostles themselves and this is the sense in which Irenaeus uses the term δι πρεσβύτεροι των ἀποστολων μαθηται (V. 5, 1, and cf. V. 33, 3 ; V. 6, 2). There is no example in second century literature, they say, of the term Presbyter being used for an apostle, cf. Bernard, p. xlvii.

Who is this 'Presbyter' who wrote the Gospel and epistles? The critics refer us to a statement of Papias who, while describing the sources of his information, says he tried to find out all that the presbyters reported as being said by Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord—and also what Aristion and the presbyter John say. It seems clear that two Johns are indicated here and this is the view of Eusebius himself (HE III, 39, cf. Bardy[1]). Eusebius mentions the fact that there are two tombs at Ephesus bearing the name of John and suggests that perhaps the John not the apostle wrote the Apocalypse. No one in tradition ever suggested he wrote the Gospel. Yet this is the individual brought in to fill the role of πρεσβύτερος in John ii and iii, and claim authorship of the Fourth Gospel, as well as the epistles. Bernard adopting substantially the view of Harnack sums up : 'John the presbyter was the writer and editor of the Fourth Gospel, although he derived his narrative material from John the son of Zebedee' (p. lxiv).

[1] Art. *Jean le Presbytre, Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, col. 845.

On what grounds is based the assertion that the term πρεσβύτερος is never used of an apostle ? It is necessary of course to exclude beforehand, John ii and iii and to interpret Papias' use of the word as 'disciple of an apostle' though many think he uses it also of apostles.

Moreover the total number of references to 'presbyter' in the literature of the first two centuries is not so large as to warrant any categoric assertion of the kind. Further, the appellation πρέσβυτερος at the head of John ii and iii surely singles the author out in a very special way, far too special a way, one might think, for a mere disciple of an apostle, otherwise practically unknown. Yet on the assumption that it is the Apostle himself, how suitable a name ! John, the last survivor of the Twelve and now no doubt far older than all those he lived with, is surely *the* Elder par excellence, cf. Bardy 846.

One further question remains to be asked. If the critics are correct, then the composition of the Fourth Gospel was closely similar to that of the second. As Mark was the follower of Peter and recorded his memories in Peter's old age, so John the Presbyter, a disciple of the son of Zebedee would have recorded *his* memoirs in the Apostle's old age.

But if this be so, how can one account for the startling difference in tradition ? Whereas the part played by Mark has always been plain in the record of tradition and the Gospel is under his name not Peter's nothing similar is to be found in the tradition of the Fourth Gospel. There is not the faintest suggestion that the Presbyter or anyone else but the Apostle wrote it, cf. reply of *Bib. Comm.* E.B. 180.

R. C. FULLER.

REFLECTIONS ON SOME RECENT VIEWS ON DEUTERONOMY

IN a previous article[1] the new view of Robertson and Brinker on the origin of Deuteronomy was expounded. That view must now be commented on and criticized.

I would like to give first a few reflections 'ad hominem'—points which strike one immediately, especially with regard to those more or less independent matters which they discuss on the margin of the essential view, though every point has its place in and relevance to the main theory.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

1. 'Law is the fundamental phenomenon in the history of any people.' This rings true : and it is certainly more acceptable than the Wellhausen view that nomism is the last step in religious evolution. Robertson would admit that 'there was considerable literary activity in the exilic period'. Gressman, however, points out that post-exilic conditions were not conducive to any great literary endeavour.[2] But perhaps the views of both could be reconciled by holding that a primitive nucleus of law, developed by practice and adjustment in the course of centuries, was recodified and redrafted in the exile period.

2. 'The composition of the law in the exile period is contrary to the firm tradition of the Hebrew people : the Torah was ever the warp and woof in the texture of their existence.' Again this will meet with general approval ; though we must distinguish with Lagrange[3] between a literary tradition and an historical tradition. But we might explain it as before—that Moses was responsible for a nucleus of law and tradition, that this was developed, and that the combined material took its final literary form in the exile period.

3. 'The Hebrews are not a childlike, primitive people.' This again is a welcome change from the Wellhausen view of Israel's early history. We can agree, then, that they were well able to adapt themselves to changing conditions. That they actually did so, however, and that by altering what seems to be an essential point of their law, does not immediately follow. It needs proof. And all that Robertson offers us is his assertion—'they could and did adapt themselves'.

4. The same applies to his statements on the prophets. He presents a reasonable explanation of those figures who are undoubtedly somewhat puzzling in the books of Samuel, but it is surely stretching the laws of evidence a little to use this probable explanation as part of his explana-

[1] SCRIPTURE, IV (Oct. 1951), 356 ff.
[2] H. Gressmann, *Die Aufgabe der alt. Forschung.* Z.A.W., 1924.
[3] Lagrange in *Revue Biblique*, 1898.

tion of the whole situation. This applies even more to his account of the rivalry between the priestly families and the obliteration of the Samaritan tradition. It sounds plausible enough, but it is a point which needs proof, not one which can be used as proof. It is always rather a doubtful procedure to use a missing link as part of a chain of evidence.[1]

We turn now to the essential part of his thesis. Undoubtedly there is much in it that is well founded. For the Israelites the law was always, ultimately, a God-given law. This means that the priest is the natural custodian of the law. Now it is generally accepted by Catholics to-day that 'Mosaic legislation' can mean law originated by Moses and developed according to his spirit and by his authority. Therefore we might well expect that this law would be developed by the priesthood connected with the various shrines. The whole point is, however, whether there were many shrines.

MANY SHRINES IN ISRAEL BEFORE SOLOMON?

This question is usually taken as a fixed point, almost on a dogmatic basis, in any study of the Pentateuch problem : the 'conservatives' taking their stand on unity of sanctuary, the 'liberals' refusing to consider such unity before the reform of Josias. Then, having accepted this basic principle, authors attempt to rewrite Israel's history in a way which would account for the apparent conflict between law and practice.

[1] In any work of historical reconstruction, especially that of an age as remote as that with which we are concerned, there must necessarily be a certain 'apriorism', giving the appearance of a vicious circle. One can only adopt an hypothesis, take up a certain position in relation to the known facts, and from this standpoint consider how the hypothesis fits the facts and what sort of explanation it provides for problems still unsolved. If it does not contradict any of the data and does not demand a forced reading of them, it is to that extent a good hypothesis ; and if it provides a good explanation of points still doubtful it will in turn receive confirmation proportionate to the probability of this explanation.

We do admit a certain proof by converging probabilities. But in Robertson's theory there does not appear to be sufficient convergence ; it needs the main body of the theory to bring all the lines of argument to a point—and yet the theory itself demands the support of these lines of argument. The difference might be clarified by comparisons : on the one hand we have an arch in which the separate stones are not self-supporting but give and receive mutual support, the whole being kept firmly in place by a keystone ; on the other hand we have a roof which is supported by pillars which themselves depend on the roof—leaving us, so to speak, hanging in the air.

A good example of the caution needed in using this type of argument and of the confusion likely to arise is found precisely in this question of unity of sanctuary which from one point of view is one of the data to be explained by a theory and from another point of view is part of the theory itself. One can assume that such unity did or did not exist and argue accordingly, but in so far as the subsequent arguments depend on, rather than converge to, the basic assumption, to that extent we are likely to be faced with a theory which is indeed consistent but which remains hanging in the air.

A more instructive method seems to me to be a study of the situation *de facto*—a study of all those occasions in the historical books where sacrifice is said to have taken place. The only work I know which approaches the problem from this point of view is that of H. Poels '*Examen Critique de l'Histoire du Sanctuaire de l'Arche*' [1897]. Unfortunately, this author too is convinced of the unity of sanctuary, and explains away the most difficult situations by an ingenious appeal to philology. So obvious was it to the sacred writer, says Poels, that there was only one sanctuary, that he does not hesitate to call it by different names ; and it is this which has given rise to confusion. Gabaon (a high-place), Nob (a hill), Bethel (house of God), Gilgal (a circle—the circle of stones that forms the altar)—all these indicate the one and only sanctuary of the ark of the convenant which is at Silo. Lagrange[1] gives the book a lengthy review in the *Revue Biblique*, but only to show how impossible it is : most people will agree with his conclusion : 'This paper-strategy is not so easily reconcilable with the terrain itself. Let the author come to Palestine and see for himself—he will find it is not the site which will give way'.

However, it is most instructive to follow ourselves this study of the relevant passages. Judges xix–xx seems to show cult taking place at Bethel, Mispah and Silo : this is the starting point of Poels's theory, but the passage is too confused to draw any certain inference from it.[2] The sacrifice at Hebal (Jos. viii, 30) and at Sichem (Jos. xxiv, 27) need cause no difficulty, as the ark of the covenant, which up to this time seems to have had no fixed site, can be presumed to be present. In Judges ii, 1–5, there is a sacrifice at Bokim ; but this is an allegorical passage, containing not historical narrative but doctrine. Poels quotes Lagrange to the effect that if it is lawful for ancient writers to hand on history in the guise of doctrine, it is equally legitimate for them to present a doctrine under the guise of history.

[1] Revue Biblique, 1897, pp. 631 ff.

[2] For some suggested solutions to the problem, see Lagrange, *Le Livre des Juges*, 1903, p. 332.

Various attempts have been made to situate the places in question : see

L. Heidet, *Maspha et les Villes de Benjamin* . . . Revue Biblique 1894 p. 322. *Le Voyage de Saul* in Biblica, 1920, pp. 341–52; 518–32; and 1921, pp. 363–68.

P. Vincent : Revue Biblique, 1922, pp. 364 ff.

P. Abel, *La Question Gabaonite et l'Onomasticon*, Revue Biblique, 1934, pp. 346–77.

From topographical indications, Alt suggests el-Bireh for Mispah but this is not considered likely. Muilenburg and Abel put it at Tell en-Nasbeh, while Albright, Buhl, Hertenburg, Robinson and Smith identify it with Neby Samwil. The official reports of the excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh seem to point to its being Mispah. See *Tell en-Nasbeh*. Vol. I. The Archæological and Historical Results. Ed. C. C. McCown, Palestine Institute of the Pacific School of Religion. California, 1947.

But what about such occasions as the sacrifice of Gedeon at Ophra (Judges vi, 19–24), of Jephte at Mispah-Gilead (Judges xi, 11), and the sanctuary of Dan in Judges xvii ? Poels claims that the whole purpose of these accounts is to discredit the shrines in question. But a careful reading seems to show that what the author is disparaging is unlawful, idolatrous cult—not the place where it is performed. In the story of Gedeon, for example, there is not the slightest indication that the sacrifice he offers is unlawful ; in fact, he offers it at the express command of an angel, and it is followed by two miracles to show God's choice of him, and by the victory over the Madianites. It is only later, when he makes an idol, that a note of disapproval creeps into the narrative ; and even then, it ends with approval of Gedeon in general, rebuking his followers for not keeping faith with his descendants 'according to all the good which he had done for Israel'.

How are we to explain this apparent multiplicity of shrines ? In '*Le Lieu de Culte dans la Legislation Rituelle des Hebreux*' (Gand, 1894) Van Hoonacker argues as follows. In the early days of Hebrew history all killing had a sacred, sacrificial character ; but Exodus xx, 24 allows the 'private sacrifices'—ordinary slaughtering for everyday needs—to take place at 'private altars'. Because of the danger of idolatry Lev. xvii, 3 ff. repeals the exception—all killing, public and private, must take place at the central sanctuary. This was practicable in their compact desert community, but in preparation for the larger circumstances of the Promised Land, Deut. xii, 15 ff. reaffirms the principle of unity and removes private killing altogether from the sphere of sacrifice.

It would be a formidable task either to prove or to disprove this theory ; but I certainly think the roots of the solution at least are there. The study of the legislation of the Pentateuch seems to indicate unity of sanctuary. The study of the situation de facto shows us that other shrines did exist. Surely a reasonable way of combining the two is to say that the law allowed only one central sanctuary for the whole nation, but that in practice exceptions were made, based on the old law of Exodus xx, 24. This law allows 'private altars', of undressed stone, to be erected in addition to the central shrine—not indeed according to the whim of the individual, but by God's express command—'wherever I shall recall the memory of my name'. And this is precisely what happens in the historical books. Gedeon at Ophra, Samson's father in Judges xiii, the confusing number of places where Samuel is said to have offered sacrifice—all these can be explained as instances of God's express command, and in no way at variance with the rights of any central sanctuary. Note two examples in particular. In Josue's sacrifice at Hebal, Jos. viii, 30–35, it is definitely stated that the sacrifice is offered on an altar of undressed stone : this may be the gloss of a scrupulous but ignorant

scribe, but equally we can explain it precisely as the fulfilment of the
law of Exodus. Again, when Saul's army, tired after battle, kill and eat
as they stand (I Sam. xiv, 31 ff.) Saul rebukes them, not for the sacrifice,
but only because they eat the blood ; and he himself goes on to sacrifice
on a boulder—surely an altar of undressed stone. The final verse of
the passage : 'And he then first began to build an altar to the Lord',
has all the air of a gloss, but in any case is capable of various explanations
not at variance with our point.

However, the explanation of the fact is less important for present
purposes than the fact itself. Whatever status one attributes to the
central shrine, it appears that one must admit that there were other
centres of religious life in Palestine during the period of the Judges.

PRINCIPLE OF BIBLICAL INERRANCY

Let us now see what guidance the church has to offer on the subject.
The basic fact with which we start is the inerrancy of scripture. The
sacred books are never false or mistaken. This means immediately that
we know that an exilic priesthood could not have rewritten the history
of the nation with complete disregard for the facts merely in order to
give some show of historical basis for the new laws which they had
composed. However, this is not as simple as it might sound. In the
first place the exact text must be fixed. Granted that the writer does not lie,
we have to find out what he actually wrote ; and it is the task of textual
criticism to decide whether many significant texts are really part of the
original. Consider, for example, the phrase so often quoted for one side
or the other in this discussion, 'At that time there was no king in Israel ...'
If that is an authentic part of the text, then it does mean a great deal ;
but it has no value whatever if it is an uninspired gloss. Take also the
names of places : we have seen that in one text it seems possible that
Sichem has been written instead of Silo, and Robertson also suggests
that Gilgal is a deliberate alteration of Sichem, implying disrepute for
this northern shrine. If the author says there was a shrine at Sichem,
then there certainly was one, and no theory which denies that is worthy
of consideration. But we must be sure that this is what the inspired
text does say. In the second place, we have to take into account 'genera
litteraria' ; what the inspired author says is true—in the sense in which
he says it. We know, for example, that the sacred author cannot be
accused of error when he describes physical phenomena according to
the views of his age. The same applies to his history—it will be true,
but it will be written according to the manner of his time. Now I think
we may say that it is doubtful if the ancient writers ever wrote history
as the moderns do, merely to give an account of the facts ; to them
history was always to some extent a thesis. We have seen that most
people would admit at least the possibility that such narratives as that

concerning the 'place of weeping' (Bokim, Judges ii, 1–5) is doctrine given under the appearance of history. So also the use of Moses' name ; law and tradition can be called Mosaic in the mind of the sacred authors, in so far as it originated with Moses and was continued in his spirit. (So among Catholics, we find Heinisch and Vaccari admitting varying degrees of post-Mosaic development of tradition and law.) Again, we do not deny the fact that writers selected, arranged and presented their facts in a way which would suit their purpose. [In Chronicles, for instance, it is safe to say that the author was inspired by prejudice against the monarchy in his presentation of certain facts : we may well admit the same for their anti-Samaritan prejudice]. But we can never go so far as to say that it allowed them to distort the facts or to write falsehood in order to discredit the northern kingdom. This means also that we could admit with Robertson the possibility of the development of the original law of unity of sanctuary to plurality ; one could allow (though it would need good arguments to support it) that such a development could be attributed to Moses, but we could not accept the theory that the text has been deliberately altered or history rewritten in order to conceal the fact that such a change took place.

A SUGGESTED SOLUTION

It is not possible here to attempt a complete analysis of the theory of Robertson and Brinker ; but now that we have clarified our attitude to its basic presumptions, let us see if we can suggest a reading of Israel's history from the point of view of the theory, while remaining faithful to the traditional view in essentials.

The more or less loosely cohering tribes—specifically distinct from the Egyptians but with close ties with neighbouring peoples in Arabia and Canaan—were moulded into a strict unity and given a national consciousness by the experiences of Sinai. Nor was it merely a natural phenomenon giving them a national unity ; it was essentially a religious experience forming them and making them conscious of being a religious community, a theocracy. Thirty years wandering in the seclusion of the desert further cemented this unity, and it was definitely a 'holy nation' which came to the borders of their promised land. Now the very purpose of their existence was the adoration of the one true God, and the first commandment given them by God at Sinai was this : 'I am the Lord thy God . . . thou shalt not have strange gods before me'. We have not necessarily to understand a fully developed theology of monotheism immediately from this moment. The Lord their God is one God ; this central fact is clear, but future revelation and reflection will have to make clear what this involves. How is it to affect their attitude towards image-worship, for instance ? To pour scorn on the worship of 'dumb idols, the works of men's hands' becomes a common

theme in the sacred literature of the Hebrews, but I find it hard to believe that these peoples did actually adore the particular block of stone or wood ; surely they were to a certain extent conscious of the deity which these things represented ? The difficulty is that they had not that degree of reflection which would allow them to make this distinction clear. (It is worth bearing in mind the objection which Catholics meet even to-day concerning their 'image-worship'. We can distinguish easily between the object and that which the object represents, but if some of our contemporaries find such a distinction difficult, how much more so these ancient peoples with no natural bent for philosophical distinction and no tradition of that sort.) So there would always be in the minds of the people some confusion between image-worship and the worship of false gods, fetichism, totemism, etc. For this reason then, although the essential commandment was to adore Yahweh alone, yet, in order to keep them as far as possible from the corruption of this ideal, He would have them worship in a way different from that of other peoples ; they were not even to have graven images before Him. Further, in order to stress His uniqueness still more and their own uniqueness as His chosen adorers, they shall worship at one place only. But apart from this one place, provision is made for other 'private sanctuaries', not to be erected at the whim of the individual but with the consent of God : 'in whatsoever place I shall recall my name'. This subsidiary point undergoes various changes in the course of centuries ; it is, for instance, abrogated by Leviticus precisely because of the danger which had been foreseen and which was the cause of the essential law of unity, namely, contamination by idolatry. The reservation of all killing (for, as Van Hoonacker shows, even ordinary killing had for the Hebrews a certain sacrificial character) to one site was quite practicable in the straightened circumstances of their desert wandering. But later, when they were preparing to enter the more expansive situation of the Promised Land, this strict unity was found to be impracticable. Moses therefore reasserts the principle of unity, but alleviates the practical difficulty by distinguishing completely between sacred and profane killing. The former is reserved entirely to the central sanctuary, and the latter is made free.

With this law they go into Canaan. I think we can and must admit some loss of cohesion in the confusion following the invasion. The whole question is, how much ? Which would prevail, their national consciousness or the actual conditions ? A fair reading of the history as well as a just interpretation of the psychological state of the people would seem to lead us to a compromise. In theory they were still strongly nationalistic ; they would not immediately and automatically relinquish their birthright, and in principle they recognized the fact that they, the twelve tribes from the desert were a unity, distinct from the native inhabitants. But in practice they found it easier to come to terms with

the people among whom their lot had been cast, and harder to keep touch with each other. What would this involve for their religion? Assimilation to the local cult? Not deliberately, not automatically; we know the immediate reaction of the tribes when the Transjordan members erected a memorial altar (Jos. xxii). They would have acknowledged an ideal unity of cult, for they knew that Moses had reaffirmed this principle of unity on the eve of the entry into Canaan. But in the press of circumstances they found it more convenient to remember the older law of Exodus[1] with its useful codicil allowing for special supplementary shrines. They would take full advantage of this, perhaps undue advantage. 'In quo memoria fuerit nominis mei'. Robertson says they would do this the more willingly because of the association of such ex-pagan sanctuaries as Sichem with the patriarchs: I think it is equally legitimate to read the history the other way round; as Lods says: 'The high-places of the Canaanites became sanctuaries where Yahweh alone was venerated. The story went round that it was He who had in days of yore called forth their foundation by revealing himself there to one or other of Israel's ancestors'[2] We need not insist; the point is that these other sanctuaries came into existence precisely in virtue of the law of Exodus, and that they in no way conflicted with the theoretical recognition of the primacy of the ark of the covenant. But if unity was still recognized in theory, there arose in practice precisely the danger which had been the cause of the law in the first place—idolatry and contamination by the other peoples. The Hebrews are, moreover, a theocracy. This supernatural aspect must never be overlooked if we are to understand the history of Israel. It is not just racial purity which is at stake. They are set apart from other nations to be the bearers of God's revelation, and particularly of His final revelation in His Son.

God therefore decided that the time had come to draw the people together again, away from their neighbours, into one. Of course, natural factors play their part. In this case there is the danger of enemies from without, for the Philistines are exerting pressure on the coast and threatening the very existence of the people. To face them it is essential that the people stand together. Another factor may also have contributed—the natural evolution of the people; the partial and spasmodic single leadership they have had under various 'judges' has been very successful, they had seen other nations working in the same way and reached a stage when a permanent united leadership appealed to them; they wanted a king. The man chosen by God to achieve all these ends is Samuel. A judge himself in both the natural function of leadership and the religious function of legislating, he is in a position to see the

---

[1] Ex. 20, 24. See pp. 5 and 6, above.

[2] A. Lods. Article in the collection *Record and Revelation*, Oxford, 1938, on the origins of the religion of Israel.

disastrous effects of lack of cohesion and to take steps against it. The law and traditions have been developed at the various sanctuaries up and down the land.[1] Samuel contrives to persuade the nation to return to unity of sanctuary in practice as well as in principle and to accept a unified version of the law and traditions. The law is drawn up on the basis of the final form given by Moses, and Samuel frames it in parenetical style—which we now find in Deuteronomy. The earlier traditions are combined into a more or less single account ; only major variations or traditions which, because of the importance of the shrine to which they were attached were themselves important, were allowed to stand, giving occasional parallel accounts of some incidents. This is the Pentateuch.

L. JOHNSTON.

Ushaw College, Durham.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

In the parable of the 'great supper' the master of the house bids his servant to 'go out into the highway and hedges and compel them to come in that my house may be filled' (Luke xiv, 23). Under the symbol of the great supper our Lord is speaking of His Messianic Kingdom, of the Church. How can it be said that men are 'compelled' to enter the Church ? Membership of the Church is impossible without the virtue of faith, and the act of faith is an act of the free will made by the assistance of God's grace.

It is worth remarking, in the first place, that not every detail of a parable necessarily has its counterpart in the reality figured by the story. But there is no need in the present case to exclude the 'compulsion' from the application of the parable. The Greek word used does mean 'to compel, constrain, force' but 'compulsion' can be of various kinds and does not necessarily denote the application of physical force which makes a free act impossible. It may be of interest to examine the instances where the word ἀναγκάζειν occurs in the New Testament.

[1] I have refrained from introducing the question of the priests which would complicate the matter unduly. But unless one holds that the history of the development of the priesthood has been hopelessly confused by a later priestly hand—a position scarcely tenable by a Catholic—it is clear that members of the priestly class, custodians of the law and the traditions of the community, were established up and down the land, not merely at the main sanctuary ; not even, in the troubled days of the Judges, in touch with it. Even if one does not admit the suggested explanation of minor sanctuaries, this factor itself will be an inevitable source of variation in law and tradition.

In only one is there question of physical force and even there its use did not literally compel men to act against their free will. St Paul after his conversion recalled that previously in his mistaken zeal he had had recourse to punishment to induce Christians to abandon their religion (Acts xxvi, 11). The imperfect used here is ambiguous as it may be either frequentative or conative. The Douay Version followed by the Authorized Version has the former sense: 'Often-times punishing them, in every synagogue, I compelled them to blaspheme'. This translation implies that Paul's efforts met with success but not that his victims were deprived of the use of their free wills—the history of the martyrs suffices to prove the contrary. The Revised Version adopts the conative sense: 'I strove to make them blaspheme'. The Westminster Version has ingeniously preserved the ambiguity of the original: 'I punished them to make them blaspheme'.

In the next five instances the three versions just quoted all use either 'compel' or 'constrain', and in the first four the RV following the AV agrees with the DV. Acts xxviii, 19: 'I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar' (WV 'compelled'); I Cor. xii, 11: 'I am become foolish; you have compelled me' (also WV); Gal. ii, 3: 'But neither Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised' (WV 'constrained'); Gal. ii, 14: 'How dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?' (WV 'constrain'); Gal. vi, 12: 'they constrain you to be circumcised' (so DV, AV, WV; RV 'compel'). In all these cases the 'compulsion' was moral and in no way attacked the free will of those concerned.

The remaining instance occurs in the parallel passages Matt. xiv, 22 and Mark vi, 45: 'Forthwith Jesus obliged his disciples to go up into the boat' (so DV in both; AV and RV in both 'constrained'; WV in both 'compelled').

In all these instances, whatever the form of compulsion adopted, the persons 'compelled' remained free agents. There is, therefore, every justification for understanding Luke xiv, 23, in the same sense. Moreover, as the master of the house sent out only one servant to bring in a considerable number of guests, as is implied by the context, there could be no question of other than moral persuasion. Finally may be added that Plato uses the word for 'convincing' by reasoning, *Gorgias* 472*b*. The word has thus also the sense of 'persuade' which exactly suits our passage: 'persuade them to come in'. An alternative would be 'induce them to come in'.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

BOOK REVIEWS

Gerico e Dintorni by P. Agostino Augustinovic, o.f.m. (Gerusalemme, Tipogafia dei PP. Francesani, 1951) Pp. 208. Price not stated.

On the title-page this book, bound in a stiff paper cover, is called a 'Guida', but this is a rather misleading appellation. It is by no means a popular guide. It is a learned account, historical and archæological, of Jericho and the surrounding country from the earliest times to the present day. The first 99 pages are devoted to the town and the rest to places and objects of interest in the neighbourhood. There is a bibliography, an index, and a carefully constructed map. In addition footnotes give copious references to articles in learned magazines and other literature. These will be found most useful by the student. There are sixty-five illustrations. One of these reproduces a photograph of a sycomore tree (*Ficus sycomorus*) standing in modern Jericho just as one stood in Herodian Jericho, as is recorded in the story of Zaccheus. On the question of the date of the fall of the city before the invading Israelites the evidence is set down with the conflicting interpretations of Garstang and Vincent and references to intermediate opinions. The author's conclusion is that a decisive answer cannot be given till perhaps some new discovery settles the matter one way or the other. It is to be hoped that the new excavations now planned may provide the required evidence.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

Tobie, traduit par R. Pautrel, s.j. Pp. 54. 165 francs. *Le Livre des Proverbes* traduit par Dom Hilaire Duesberg, o.s.b., et Paul Auvray, de l'Oratoire. Pp. 135. 405 francs. *Le Cantique des Cantiques*, traduit par A. Robert, p.s.s. Pp. 61. 195 francs. *Les Epîtres de Saint Paul à Timothée et Tite*, traduit par Pierre Dornier, p.s.s. Pp. 64. 195 francs. (Les Éditions du Cerf, 1951.)

These four slim volumes are recent additions to the new French translation of Holy Scripture which is coming to be known by the distinctive title of *La Bible de Jérusalem*. Each has its short introduction with two sets of notes, the upper one on the page giving essential information about textual criticism, and the lower, explanations and illustrations where such seemed required. With one exception the introductory pages have succeeded in combining brevity with an adequate presentation of what the educated but not specialist reader would desire to know about canonicity, authorship, date of composition and similar matters. The exception is made by the four pages prefixed to the Book of Judith. Here the question of the historical character of the book is

dismissed in six lines with quotations from A. Miller and A. Robert indicating a preference for the view that the author's intention was to convey his teaching under the form of fiction. Little, however, is said about the doctrine of the book, a subject which is admirably treated in the introductions to Proverbs and the Pastoral Epistles. The Canticle from its nature gives little occasion for doctrinal exposition.

The translator of the Book of Judith has preferred the recension represented by the Codex Sinaiticus and the Old Latin to that preserved in the Greek manuscripts known as the Vaticanus and the Alexandrinus. Many of the educated public for whom the series is intended, would have liked to know the main characteristics of the two recensions and the reasons for the preference accorded to the former. The composition of the work is assigned to a date 'towards the third or fourth century' and to the hand of a writer living in the Diaspora, perhaps in Egypt. The translation reads smoothly and easily, though an occasional phrase seems to depart from the simplicity of the original. 'He explained to his father that his journey had been successful' is given as 'puis il mit son père au courant du voyage' (xi, 15)

The task of translating the Book of Proverbs is of particular difficulty for two reasons. The proverbs are set down in isolation without a context to elucidate their meaning with the result that the precise thought intended is not always apparent, and in not a few instances the text is corrupt. The version has been prepared by two translators but no indication is given as to the division of labour and a perusal does not suggest by any change of style that two minds have been at work. The aim has clearly been to reproduce the thought without undue regard to verbal fidelity. The Revised Version renders xv, 30 as follows :

> The light of the eyes rejoiceth the heart :
> *And* good tidings make the bones fat.

This lacks intelligibility and is not expressed in modern language. How superior is the version offered here :

> Un regard bienveillant réjouit le coeur ;
> une bonne nouvelle ranime les forces.

But verbal fidelity is sometimes necessary to secure fidelity to the sense. In the translation of xvi, 15.

> Dans la lumière du visage royal est la vie ;
> et telle qu'une pluie printanière, sa bienveillance,

the word 'rain' has been substituted for 'cloud'. But rain in the thirsty land of Palestine is a present actual benefit of which a cloud gives hope as the royal goodwill of favours. And the word *nephesh* can surely not have the meaning 'throat' in xxv, 15 :

> Telle la fraîcheur de la neige au fort de la moisson :
> tel un messager fidèle pour qui l'envoie
> —car il rafraîchit la gorge de son maître,

nor in xxvii, 7 'Gorge rassasiée méprise le miel'. The book is unfortunately marred by some inaccuracies in the critical notes and in the transcription of the Hebrew, as in the notes on xxiii, 11 and xxvii, 24.

A. Robert, a Sulpitian professor at the Institut Catholique of Paris, argues powerfully for the correctness, in its main lines, of the traditional allegorical interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles. He finds that it is no isolated body among the many books of the Bible. On the contrary it adopts and utilizes the traditional images and themes. Chief of these is the representation of the union between Yahweh and His people as that of two spouses, and this is the main clue to the interpretation of the poem. They are presented at first. as separated from each other, but are seen gradually to draw together. Despite the accomplished union their reciprocal approaches are depicted by convention as those of persons merely betrothed and their reunion in conjugal life as that of a new marriage. The one discreet indication of the true relation between the reconciled lovers is found by the commentator in viii, 6–7. The maidens of i, 3 are understood to be figures of the non-Israelite nations, the royal apartments of i, 4 of the temple at Jerusalem. More difficult to understand is the alleged personification of the nation as the royal mother in iii, 11. According to the main line of interpretation the Israelite nation is the spouse.

P. Dornier, another Sulpitian, who is professor of Holy Scripture at the Lyons Seminary, has given in his introduction an excellent account of the early stages of Church organization and also an admirable defence of the authenticity of the pastoral epistles. These he thinks were written by one of the Apostle's secretaries, a procedure which would account for the combination of definite Pauline phraseology with other non-Pauline elements. The translation seems at times to be unnecessarily free. Is there any justification for the addition of the name of Christ in Tit. iii, 7, 'par la grâce du Christ'? Or for the addition in II Tim. ii, 18, 'ils se sont écartés loin de la vérité'? Or for the translation of II Tim. iv, 5, 'acquitte-toi à la perfection de ton ministère'? Compare iv, 7. In Tit. i, 10 the Greek has 'For there are many', not 'Nombreux sont en effet'. Again in II Tim. i, 13 the text has 'Hold on to', not 'Prends'.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.